

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 11 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 11, and have canceled claims 2, 6, 9, 10, 12-14, and 17-20 (claims 8, 15, 16, and 21-30 were previously canceled). The changes to these claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the HP publication (“HP Trade-in: Overview”) in view of *Ellenson et al.* (“*Ellenson*”) (US 2003/0200151 A1) and *Seretti et al.* (“*Seretti*”) (US 5,978,776) (as noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 2, 6, 9, and 10). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 1 and 11, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1 and 11 to specify features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the applied references. In particular, each of claims 1 and 11 has been amended to specify 1) referring to a components quote table to determine a trade-in quote and a cash-out quote, and 2) varying the state of options depending upon whether the cash-out quote is either within or outside of a preset allowable cash-out value range. These features are not disclosed or suggested in any of the *HP publication*, the *Ellenson* reference, and the *Seretti* reference.

In view of the foregoing, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were to have combined the HP publication, the *Ellenson* reference, and the *Seretti* reference in the manner proposed by the Examiner, this combination would not have resulted in a method or system that includes each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 11.

**Application No. 10/674,988**

**Amendment dated February 24, 2010**

**Response to Office Action mailed November 24, 2009**

Thus, the combination of the HP publication, the *Ellenson* reference, and the *Seretti* reference would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 11 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 11, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti*. Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti*, and further in view of Official Notice. Each of claims 3 and 4 ultimately depends from claim 1. The Official Notice taken by the Examiner does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti* relative to the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 3 and 4 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti*, and further in view of Official Notice for at least the reason that each of these claims ultimately depends from claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti*, and further in view of the article by *Marshall* entitled “How Internet Cookies Work” (“the *Marshall* article”). Claim 7 depends from claim 1. The *Marshall* article does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and *Seretti* relative to the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein. Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the HP publication in view of

**Application No. 10/674,988**  
**Amendment dated February 24, 2010**  
**Response to Office Action mailed November 24, 2009**

*Ellenson* and *Seretti*, and further in view of the *Marshall* article for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

As noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 12-14, 17, and 20. As such, the rejection of claims 12-14, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the HP publication in view of *Ellenson*, and further in view of Applicants' Own Admissions (AOA) is moot.

In light of the cancellation of claims 18 and 19, the rejection of claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the HP publication in view of *Ellenson* and AOA, and further in view of *Seretti* is moot.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 11, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ITECP002).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
**Customer Number 25920**